

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,434	08/18/2003	Hyun Sung Chang	3364P129	8072
8791	7590 12/04/2006		EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN			BAYAT, ALI	
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

w. r		
1	Application No. Applicant(s)	
	10/645,434	CHANG ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ali Bayat	2624
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 Au	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2-10 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 18 August 2003 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	election requirement. • a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is objected if	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/15/05;8/29/05;8/18/03.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other: See Continue	te atent Application

Continuation of Attachment(s) 6). Other: Reasons for allowance for claims 2 and 3...

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

 Claims 3 and 9-10 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim ends with a period. The period, for ending the claims 3, and 9-10 are missing.
 Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi (US 6,356,587) in view of Paik (US 6,370,279).

In regard to claim 1, Choi provides for a method for detecting (Fig.3, element 26, col. 3 line 62, note detector) and classifying block edges from DCT (Discrete Cosine Transform)-compressed images (col.4, lines 2-10, note "the detector 26 determines existence of edge components in a DCT block according to a number of non-zero coefficients of the 63 coefficients for a high frequency region, excluding a direct current component. For example, as it can be known that, the more the number of non-zero coefficients, the more edge components exist, the detector 26 may provide a relevant signal accordingly to the format convertor 27, to determine a edge level according to the number of non-zero coefficients"), which is for detecting the edge of each block from

DCT-compressed images (col.2 lines 2-4, note "detector 26 determining existence of edge components in a DCT block according to a number of non-zero coefficients of the 63 coefficients" and classifying an edge direction component of each block, the method comprising:

(a) Extracting DCT coefficients by N.times.N blocks constituting the compressed image (Fig.3, element 22, col.3 line 66-col.4 line 1, note a DCT block inverse quantized corresponds to compressed image); and (b) applying an arithmetic operation defined for each direction component to the DCT coefficients obtained in (a) (Fig.3, element 27, col.4 lines 13-18, note "Convertor 27, carries out basic format conversion operations as well as an interpolation operation of the edge components of the input data according to the equation 1" the coded portion corresponds to applying an arithmetic operation to the DCT coefficients). Choi does not provide for comparing the results of the arithmetic operations to determine the edge direction component in (b) and also classifying block edges (in preamble). Paik teaches classifying block edges and determining the edge direction by comparing the results of the arithmetic operations (col.4 lines 19-33, note that obtained DCT coefficients are compared with first and second predetermined threshold values T1 and T2, for detecting the edge direction and further teaching the degrees of direction (45° or 135°), which corresponds to classifying block edges. The prior art of Choi and Paik are combinable, because they from the same field of endeavor (block compression in moving image). One in the art would have been motivated to modify Choi according to Paik to "removing blocking artifacts, caused by another block-based image process", further "for removing blocking artifacts induced in

Art Unit: 2624

processing an image in blocks of a predetermined unit size"(col.2 lines 50-61 of Paik) and therefore it would have been obvious to one in ordinary skill in the art to modify Choi according to Paik.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 2-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the closest prior art of Choi (US 6,356,587) as modified by Paik (US 6,370,279). Directed to solving "the problem in edge components of an SD progressive, or interlaced scanning image up sampled and converted into an HD interlaced image are not exhibited on a straight diagonal line but on an irregular line, thereby displaying a distorted image" col.2 lines 5-10. The closet prior art failed to teach or suggest for. An arithmetic operation comprises a combination of H, V, and D that are the weighted sums of the extracted DCT coefficients as given according to equations in claim 2. Further the cited prior art failed to teach or suggest for a method of extracting Y(m, n)=w(m, n)X(m, n) that is a multiplication of the DCT coefficient X(m, n) by a quantitative numeric, rather than simply extracting the DCT coefficient, wherein (b) of performing each arithmetic operation comprises determining H, V, and D according to equations in claim 3.

Application/Control Number: 10/645,434 Page 5

Art Unit: 2624

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. patent 5,787,204 to Fukuda cited for removing block distortion with simple structure.

U.S. patent 5,841,477 to Kim cited for classifying each of the surrounding blocks into a nonotonus, an edge or texture class.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ali Bayat whose telephone number is 571-272-7444. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jingge Wu can be reached on 571-272-7429. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/645,434

Art Unit: 2624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Will cont

Ali Bayat AB Patent Examiner Division 2624 11/22/06 Page 6